

REMARKS

The Office action mailed July 23, 2010, has been reviewed and these remarks are responsive thereto. Claims 2 and 11 were previously canceled, and claims 7 and 15 have been canceled in the present paper, all without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 1, 3-6, 8-10, 12-14, and 16-22 are pending upon entry of the present paper. No new matter has been added. Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

Interview

The undersigned would like to thank Examiner Saltarelli for the courtesies extended during a telephone interview conducted on August 26, 2010. Pursuant to MPEP § 713.04, the below remarks include Applicants' substance of interview.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 3-10, and 12-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. pat. no. 5,600,573 to Hendricks et al. ("Hendricks"), in view of U.S. pat. no. 6,088,732 to Smith et al. ("Smith") and U.S. pat. no. 5,027,400 to Baji et al. ("Baji"). These rejections are traversed below.

Amended independent claim 1 recites, among other features, "receiving a coding and formatting request in one of at least two different formats from a user, the coding and formatting request comprising at least one auxiliary service request . . . processing at least one auxiliary service, the processing comprising: analyzing the at least one auxiliary service request associated with the at least one auxiliary service based on the analysis of the parameters contained in the coding and formatting request, configuring one or more auxiliary services processes to generate at least one requested auxiliary service based on the analyzed at least one auxiliary service request, and outputting the requested at least one auxiliary service, wherein the outputted at least one auxiliary service is combined with the coded target output content." Illustrative, non-limiting support for the amended features of claim 1 may be found in the filed specification when read as a whole, and for example, at page 4, line 22 – page 5, line 6 (providing that auxiliary service requests may be included in a coding and formatting request).

Features similar to the above-noted features recited in claim 1 were discussed during the interview, and as indicated in the Examiner's Interview Summary mailed August 27, 2010, agreement was reached that such features would distinguish over the art of record. The features recited in claim 1 are discussed further below.

As conceded in the Office Action at page 5, Hendricks fails to disclose that a coding and formatting request originates from a user. The Office Action at page 5 also indicates that Hendricks fails to describe analyzing auxiliary service requests in a coding and formatting request based on an analysis of parameters contained in the request. The Office Action at page 5 relies on the profiles described in Smith (at col. 5, line 41 – col. 6, line 61) to allegedly remedy the deficiencies of Hendricks.

As discussed during the interview, even assuming (without admitting) that the profiles described in Smith at col. 5, line 41 – col. 6, line 61 could have been analogized to the parameters recited in claim 1, Smith fails to describe a coding and formatting request comprising at least one auxiliary service request, much less processing at least one auxiliary service, the processing comprising analyzing the at least one auxiliary service request associated with the at least one auxiliary service based on the analysis of the parameters contained in the coding and formatting request, configuring one or more auxiliary services processes to generate at least one requested auxiliary service based on the analyzed at least one auxiliary service request, and outputting the requested at least one auxiliary service, wherein the outputted at least one auxiliary service is combined with the coded target output content as recited in claim 1.

Notwithstanding whether a combination of Hendricks, Smith, and Baji would have been proper, Baji fails to remedy the deficiencies of Hendricks and Smith described above with respect to claim 1. Claim 1 is distinguishable from the applied documents for at least the foregoing reasons.

Amended claim 10 recites features similar to those described above with respect to claim 1 and is distinguishable from the applied documents for at least reasons substantially similar to those discussed above.

The dependent claims are distinguishable from the applied documents for at least the same reasons as their respective base claims, and further in view of the unique combinations of features recited therein. For example, claim 9 recites “reading target content routing address

information; and configuring one or more target content routers based on the address information.” These features were distinguished from the applied documents at pages 8-9 of the Amendment filed July 11, 2010, and the discussion provided therein is incorporated herein by reference. The Office Action at pages 2-3 (“Response to Arguments”) acknowledged Applicants’ remarks regarding claim 9. The Office Action at pages 3 and 9 cites to Hendricks at col. 10, lines 24-29 to support the rejection. In particular, the Office Action at page 3 contends that because Hendricks at col. 10, lines 24-29 describes that output equipment 320 must receive programs and data and determine a proper output connection to send the programs and data to remote sites, then Hendricks must also disclose the above-noted features recited in claim 9 (because it cannot be assumed that the output equipment would have a dedicated link to each household of a sheer volume of available households). As discussed, merely determining a proper output connection to send programs and data to remote sites as described in Hendricks at col. 10, lines 24-29 fails to teach or suggest reading target content routing address information, much less configuring one or more target content routers based on the address information as recited in claim 9. Claim 9 is allowable for at least these additional reasons.

CONCLUSION

If any fees are required or if an overpayment is made, the Commissioner is authorized to debit or credit Deposit Account No. 19-0733, accordingly.

All rejections having been addressed, Applicants respectfully submit that the instant application is in condition for allowance, and respectfully solicit prompt notification of the same.

Respectfully submitted,
BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

Dated: October 25, 2010

By: /Mark E. Wilinski/
Mark E. Wilinski
Registration No. 63,230

1100 13th Street, N.W., Suite 1200
Washington, D.C. 20005-4051
Tel: (202) 824-3000
Fax: (202) 824-3001